THE

Caſe of the Diſſenting Proteſtants of IRELAND,

In Reference to a Bill of *Indulgence*, Vindicated from the Exceptions alledg'd againſt it, in a late Anſwer.

by. Joſeph Boyſe.

THE *Author* of the *Caſe* had mention'd two things deſir'd by *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, in reference to a *Bill of Indulgence, viz.*

Firſt, That it give 'em a full ſecurity for the free Exerciſe of their Religion.

Secondly, That there be no ſuch Clauſes annext to it as may diſable 'em from ſerving their King and their Country.

The *Anſwerer* undertakes to ſhew, that tho the *Author* of the *Caſe* have *truly* repreſented their deſires, he has but *weakly argued* for granting of 'em. Now, tho the *Author* is ſo conſcious to himſelf of his own mean abilities, as to be ready to ſuſpect that ſo juſt a Cauſe may have ſuffer'd by being in ſo weak hands; yet he does not ſee any ſuch ſtrength in the *Anſwerer*'s Replys, as ſhou'd diſcourage him from the defence even of thoſe weak Arguments, from any thing the Anſwerer has alledg'd to take off the force of 'em. Whether this opinion be founded on reaſon, or on that partiality to his own Cauſe (which all men are prone to) muſt be left to the Reader's Judgment.

First, *The Proteſtant Diſſenters deſire ſuch a Bill of Indulgence as ſhou'd give 'em a full ſecurity for the free Exerciſe of their Religion.*

As to this, the *Anſwerer* indeed tells us "That he believes, there are few or none but will a-"gree to it; Tho he thinks it plain the Author's Arguments do not evince the neceſſity of it.

I might therefore juſtly ſatisfy my ſelf that there are ſome conſiderations or other for which the generality even of thoſe of the Eſtabliſh't Church are willing to grant to Proteſtant Diſſenters the free exerciſe of their Religion. But ſince the *Anſwerer* thinks the former Reaſons alledg'd for it, to be inſufficient, and ſpeaks of ſuch a Toleration as rather in it ſelf a very inconvenient thing, "which they are inclin'd to grant more out of compliance with the importunity of thoſe that "deſire it, then any ſenſe of it's reaſonableneſs, as Parents humour their Children, in giving 'em "things that are pleaſing to their palates, tho prejudicial to their health, only becauſe they eagerly deſire 'em. I ſhall a little examine what he has offer'd againſt thoſe Arguments alledg'd for the *Neceſſity* and *Reaſonableneſs* of it; and I do this the rather, becauſe thoſe *Anſwers* of his ſuggeſt ſeveral common prejudices againſt Proteſtant Diſſenters, which are of late induſtriouſly ſpread, and I fear very deeply rooted in the minds of many, tho founded on very unhappy miſtakes and miſinformation about 'em; ſo that the Removal of 'em will probably tend to promote a more charitable temper in Proteſtants towards one another. And this is a deſign fit to be purſued at all times, and never more ſeaſonable then now, when there are ſo earneſt endeavours us'd to heighten our differences in order to obſtruct the happy effects of our mutual confidence and affection.

The *Firſt Argument* alledg'd in the *Caſe* is. "That ſince the ſecurity of the Proteſtant Intereſt "in this Kingdom conſiſts in the Number and Union of Proteſtants, this Bill will promote both, "by drawing Proteſtant Diſſenters from abroad, by uniting all Proteſtants at home, and by giving "the Goverment a more rooted Intereſt in the affections of Proteſtant Diſſenters.

To

To this Argument, and to all others that follow, I shall present the Reader with the *Answerer's* Reply in his own words, which is a Civility, I could have wish'd he had shewn me; and then he might have spar'd some of his most plausible Objections, and *particularly*, this I am going to Reject.

Answ. *First, This Indulgence will tend rather to the multiplicity of Sects, than to the encrease of the Number of Protestants, and will successfully promote those very Designs, which our Author vainly imagins it the best Expedient to obstruct. For a general Indulgence has always prov'd instrumental to the advancing the Popish Interest among us, and has therefore been vigorously promoted by popish Emissaries in* England, *and that by express Orders from their Superiors abroad, who have experimentally found it to be the best method of introducing Popery into a Country, and have expended very considerable Sums of Money for the purchase of Tolerations to Dissenters.*

Repl. This Reasoning of the *Answerer's*, seems to run upon a supposition, that the *Author* of the *Case* pleads for *a general Indulgence* to all sort of People whatsoever. Whereas if the *Answerer* had but taken half the pains to *understand* that *Paper*, that he has done to *find fault* with it, he wou'd have quickly found, That those *Protestant Dissenters* for whose Indulgence the Author pleads, are such as *will appear to be of the same Religion with the Establish't Church, by subscribing the Doctrinal Articles of it, as the condition of their Liberty.*

And of these the *Answerer* if he please may easily know there are but 3 Sects, (if he please to call all those sorts of Protestant Sects that are distinguish't from others, by some particular mode of Worship or Discipline) viz. *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Anabaptists*. (I include the last, because they refuse to subscribe no other of the Doctrinal Articles of the Establish't Church, but that about *Infant Baptism*) And of these latter, viz *Independents* and *Anabaptists*, there are but about six Congregations that I know of in the Kingdom. So that the Bill there pleaded for, can multiply no other Sects, than these. And I hope the *Answerer* will not deny all these to be *Protestants*. So that if the Bill be useful to invite over any of these, it will encrease the Number of Protestants in this Kingdom, and of such only.

But saith the *Answerer*, " This Bill will successfully promote those very Designs which our Au-
" thor vainly imagins it the best Expedient to obstruct.

Repl. This seems at first view very hard to be understood, but much harder to be believ'd.

The designs which the *Author* imagines this *Bill of Indulgence* will obstruct, are the decrease of the number of Protestants, their mutual jealousies and animosities, and the weakning the affections of Protestant Dissenters to the Goverment. And will such a Bill indeed successfully promote all these designs? *i. e.* will it fright any Protestants of *England*, *Scotland*, or *Wales*, from coming to plant here because they will be effectually secur'd from Persecution? will it drive the Dissenting Protestants that are here out of the Kingdom because they will be more assur'd of safety in it? Or will the Protestant Dissenters here love the Goverment the less, because it gives 'em such a legal security for their Religion? Or will it make Conforming, or Non Conforming Protestants less kind and friendly to one another, because neither of 'em have it in their power to persecute, or do any mischief to the other? Sure if the Author *argue weakly*, he that shall reason thus (as the Answerer must, if he speak here to the purpose) will not much *mend the matter*. But let's hear the *Answerer* himself.

For a general Indulgence has always prov'd instrumental to the advancing of the Popish Interest among us, and has been therefore vigorously promoted, &c.

Reply. And what signifies this, were it true, to the *Author* of the *Case*, who pleads for no such *general Indulgence*? But I would gladly know of the *Answerer*, wherein a *Toleration* to *Dissenting Protestants* can advance the *Popish Interest* here. Will the *Popish Interest* be ever the stronger, because there are more Protestants to oppose it, and because their mutual forbearance as to their lesser differences will more unite their affections and endeavours against the common enemy? And will the Popish Interest be the weaker when the number of Protestants is lessen'd, and when severity has alienated their affections from one another? 'Tis possible that Popish Emissaries have in *England* endeavour'd to procure general Tolerations, that they might share in the same favour with Protestant Dissenters: But whose fault is that? Is it *theirs*, that only pleaded for a Toleration to Protestants? or is it not more *theirs*, that by making the terms of their Communion so narrow have occasion'd so many of their fellow-Protestant to Dissent from 'em, as rendred a Toleration of 'em necessary to the publick peace? Nay, is it not *theirs*, that cou'd if they pleas'd easily distinguish betwixt Tolerating those that agree in the same Faith with 'em, and Tolerating those that wou'd obtrude all the Articles of the *Trent-Creed* upon 'em? But if the *Answerer* think that a Toleration to *Protestant Dissenters only*, will strengthen the *Popish Interest* it must be either because he thinks, that if *no Toleration* were granted 'em, they wou'd all come over to the Communion of the Establish't Church, or if a *Toleration* be granted 'em, they will many of 'em turn Papists. For the former, one wou'd think so many years Experience might sufficiently convince any man how weak such an Expectation is; for the latter, 'tis if possible a more groundless imagination then the former. I question whether the *Answerer* can produce one instance of that kind of any Protestant Dissenter even in the late Reign, turning Papist, much less when they enjoy'd liberty of Conscience.

But the *Answerer* Proceeds.

" Before I Reply to what is said concerning drawing over Dissenting Protestants from abroad " by this Bill of Indulgence, I shall propose this Question, Whether the granting liberty of Con- " science with a Sacramental Test will not be as effectual to the peopling this Kingdom with Eng- " lish Conformists, as a general Toleration without restrictive Clauses to the planting of it with " Scotch Dissenters?

Reply. The Question admits of a very easy and obvious Answer. That no English Conformists can pretend it to be any reasonable discouragement to 'em, to come and plant in this Kingdom, that their fellow Protestants are both inclin'd and in a capacity to joyn with 'em for their mutual defence against the Common Enemy. But on the other hand, not only *Scotch* but *English* Dissenters, (nay, *English Conformists* themselves if they be wise) will have the less mind to come, if they see meer Bigotry so far prevailing against our plain Common Interest, as to obstruct the best measures that can be taken for our mutual defence, by setting the Protestant Interest upon too narrow and weak a Foundation.

Answerer. But to return, *I presume, by what the Author says concerning drawing over Protestant Dissenters from abroad, he cannot mean Foreigners, &c. He must therefore wholly, or more especially, design the Dissenting Protestants of* Scotland.

Reply. The Answerer is much out in his conjecture. For *Foreigners* indeed, the *Author* did not there, as the *Answerer* well observes, intend 'em. But tho he did not exclude the Dissenting Protestants of *Scotland*, (as there is no reason, unless the *Answerer* think their company as dangerous as that of the *Irish* Papists) yet if he may freely speak his own mind, he chiefly intended those of *England*. For this *Toleration it self* can tempt none to leave *Scotland*, where their Religion is Establisht: But this Toleration without any restrictive Clauses, would probably encourage many to come over from *England*, when they shou'd understand that they may more safely venture among the *Irish* because the whole Protestant Interest is happily combin'd for their mutual preservation.

But let us hear what the *Answerer* has to say concerning the Protestant Dissenters of *Scotland*.

Answerer. — — *In reference to these, I leave it to the serious consideration of every judicious and impartial Reader.*

First, Whether that Sect among 'em, whose violent principles have unqualify'd 'em for Indulgence there, shou'd be tolerated here? Can we reasonably expect, that those who are so turbulent in their own Country, shou'd be quiet in ours? Or that by their being transplanted into another soyl, and by a kind and indulgent Cultivation of 'em we may gather Figs of this sharpest sort of Thistles?

Reply. I shall not insist on this witty expression of the *Thistles*, tho perhaps the Answerer had better have forborn it; if not out of reverence to the Scriptures, yet out of deference to the Scotch Nation, who not only bear the *Thistle* in their *Arms*, but have surrounded it with a dangerous Inscription, *Nemo me impune lacessit*. But I shall rather observe, That 'tis something doubtful whom the Answerer intends. I know none at present unqualify'd for Indulgence in *Scotland*, but those of the Episcopal Clergy, that refuse to swear to King *William*, and openly avow their adherence to King *James*. But I suppose the Answerer dos not intend them, by the *Thistles* he here speaks of, some wou'd rather have 'em cultivated as good *Figg-trees*. If he mean the *Cameronians* or *Mountaineers*, he need not be so much frighted with those monstrous creatures, for I can hear of few or none of 'em left in this Kingdom; and I suppose they'l not be included in the *Bill* the Author pleads for: For if they retain their wonted Humour, they wou'd start at the very name of a *Legal Indulgence*. But if the *Answerer* will understand the truth of the matter; those whom he seems to intend, were a people whom nothing but extreme *Oppression* had rendred *mad*; and experience shews that quite contrary to the *Answerer's* reasoning, by lenity and kindness they are coming to their right senses again: So that 'tis hop't those very sharp *Thistles* will in a little time produce sweet *Figgs*. I am sure that Regiment of 'em that's now in the King's Army has done very good Service against the French. And the whole Party that encreased under their former severitys, is now in *Scotland* almost dwindled away under the mildness of the present Government.

" *Answerer*, Secondly whether the free and publick Exercise of Religion shou'd be indulg'd to " others of 'em, who have publickly declar'd our Church-Goverment to be Antichristian, and " have solemnly sworn to extirpate Prelacy.

Reply. I suppose, for such as have *Solemnly sworn to Extirpate Prelacy*, the *Answerer* will find, that there is scarce one in several hundreds of those for whom this Indulgence is desir'd, that will fall within that number. And I think I might say the same concerning those that have *publickly declar'd their Church-Goverment Antichristian*. To what good end then does the Answerer rake into those wounds that time has done so much to close? what if I shou'd repeat to him all the severe Censures thrown on the Body of Protestant Dissenters and the avowed designs of Extirpating 'em declar'd in the many sanguinary Laws pass't against 'em both in *England* and *Scotland*? what if I shou'd remind him of those later ones in *Scotland* that made it *Capital* to be present at their Meetings? what if I shou'd tell him of all the publick writings of those of his party, that have not only openly arraign'd us as *Sebismaticks*, but *Excluded* us from the *Catholick Church*?

These are sure rigors altogether as inexcusable on the other hand. But wou'd these mutual Criminations have any tendency to unite our affections? Can either Party clear themselves from

the

the guilt of many intemperate hearts?" or shou'd not any unchriſtian ſeverities that are chargeable on either in former times ſerve as Sea marks to warn both of the danger of relapſing into thoſe exceſſes of miſguided Zeal, which all unprejudic't and moderate perſons condemn 'em for? And ſhou'd not all that wiſh for a better underſtanding between Proteſtants rather ſtudy to bury ſuch ungrateful paſſages on both hands it poſſible, in perpetual ſilence?

Anſwerer. 3*dly*, *Whether thoſe that are the moſt moderate among 'em can, with any reaſon expect, but that with the ſame meaſure they have meeted to their Brethren, the Epiſcopal Clergy in their own Country, It ſhou'd be meaſured to them again, when they come to ſettle in this Kingdom.*

Reply, I perceive the *Anſwerer* did not well underſtand matters of Fact when he propos'd this dangerous Queſtion. For if according to his own Rule, the Diſſenting Miniſters from *Scotland* may expect the ſame meaſure here, that is allow'd to the Epiſcopal Clergy there, Then they might preach in Pariſh-Churches, and enjoy the Revenues that belong to 'em, on no other terms then the *Oath of Fidelity to the King*, and *their behaving themſelves worthily in Doctrine, Life, and Converſation*, without ever declaring their Judgment in the matters of Church-Goverment.

For on theſe very terms, do all the Epiſcopal Clergy in *Scotland* that were poſſeſt of publick Churches when the King accepted that Crown, continue and are by Act of Parliament ſecured in the exerciſe of their publick Miniſtry except thoſe that were turn'd out for crimes wherein their Judgment as Epiſcopal is not concern'd. But of theſe matters I ſhall have farther occaſion to inform the *Anſwerer* more fully who I perceive is under ſtrange miſapprehenſions about 'em. Whereby it will evidently appear how little occaſion there was for the *Anſwerer*'s concluding this Paragraph with thoſe ſharp words. " So that if any Indulgence be granted, 'tis purely the reſult of our own Charitable inclinations and a " plain evidence to the World, that our juſt Reſentment of their ſeverity to others, has not alienated our " affections from 'em. For he will find 'tis not their ſeverities in *Scotland*, but his miſtakes about 'em that have kindled theſe warm Reſentments in the *Anſwerer*, and in too many others that have been impoſ'd upon by groundleſs reports.

" Anſwerer, Neither will this Indulgence probably, tend to the uniting of Proteſtants at home, as is " too fully prov'd by Experience in England; where the preſent Declaration has not had that good " effect; neither can we in reaſon expect it ſhou'd be more ſucceſsful here. For if it equally extend " to all parties and denominations of Proteſtant Diſſenters, their mutual jealouſies of one another, and " their reſpective endeavours to propagate their opinions and to promote their temporal intereſts will " naturally create great heats and animoſities. But if the benefit of the Indulgence be unequally diſtri- " buted, it will be ſo far from being a means of ſupporting that it will conſiderably weaken the Gover- " ment by diſobliging all but thoſe that are particularly encourag'd and careſs't.

Repl. The *Author* of the *Caſe* in his Argument evidently ſpeaks of an *union* between *Conforming* and *Diſſenting Proteſtants* which he ſuppoſes this Bill wou'd promote. And herein he ſuppoſes no more then what the *Parliament* of *England* did, who brought in this Bill there as the moſt *effectual means to unite all Proteſtants in affection*: And ſure this Bill muſt be a proper means to attain that end, if mens affections be beſt *united*, when they have no reaſonable ground to apprehend any danger from one another.

But the *Anſwerer* ſeems to miſtake him, as if he ſpake of the union of Diſſenting Proteſtants among themſelves. But let him underſtand it either way. " The contrary of this (he ſaith) is fully prov'd " by experience in England. If he mean that the Bill of Indulgence in *England* has not united the affections of *Conformiſt*'s and *Non Conformiſt*'s, 'tis eaſily reply'd, that tho it have not wholly remov'd all the animoſitys between 'em, yet it hae apparently leſſen'd 'em. They can converſe ſociably, they live together more peaceably, and there is no doubt, much more of mutual love among 'em, then when the proteſtant *Diſſenters* were every moment in danger of having their perſons impriſon'd and their goods diſtrain'd and ſold.

If he mean that the Bill of Indulgence in *England* has not united *Diſſenting Proteſtants* among themſelves. I ſuppoſe the *Anſwerer* is much miſtaken. For thoſe called *Preſbyterians* and *Independents* never came nearer to an Union and Accommodation of their differences then ſince the Indulgence. 'Tis true ſome other heats have ariſen at *London* about the Explication of the Doctrine of Juſtification, as there have been no leſs warm diſputes among thoſe of the Eſtabliſht Church about the Explication of a more Important Article, *Viz.* That of the Trinity; but the Indulgence has no way contributed to the one more then the other. And as for this Kingdom the *Anſwerer* muſt be a great ſtranger to it, if he think the Bill of Indulgence here pleaded for wou'd probably occaſion any jealouſie among thoſe for whom 'tis deſired, or create any heat among 'em, They have many years liv'd in entire mutual Friendſhip and as yet ſee no great hazard in their ſmaller differences becoming the fuel of any new flames, if others will not turn Incendiaries, and blow the Coals. So that this danger ſeems only a Bug-bear created by the *Anſwerer*'s own Imagination.

" Anſwerer. But, Secondly; Neither is this Indulgence ſo highly *Reaſonable* as the Author " pretends, as may appear by a particular conſideration of the Arguments he makes uſe of to " prove it.

For

For first, as the Early Zeal of the Dissenters in behalf of this Government, may entitle 'em to it's protection, so it cannot be deny'd, but that they have enjoyed it ever since the Revolution, and have Receiv'd more then ordinary marks of Royal favour, partly by the free Liberty that's granted 'em throughout the Kingdom, &c. as also by his Majesties bounty in allowing Yearly hitherto, a considerable Sum for the maintenance of their Ministers.

Repl. And do's the *Answerer* think that he has refuted the Argument, by what rather Confirms it? If the King have hitherto protected 'em, and augmented to their Ministers in *Ulster*, the Pension *K. Charles the 2d.* allow'd 'em, as a mark of the Respect he had for their Fidelity and Affection; is it not reasonable that the continuance of the same Favour shou'd be secur'd to 'em by Law, when they have done nothing to render themselves unworthy of it? It must doubtless appear so, unless the *Answerer* have a different Opinion of 'em, from what his Majesty has so often expres't, by whose approbation *a Bill of Indulgence* in their Favour (such as they now desire) was Transmitted to the last Parliament here. But if there be any thing in this *Answer* to take off the force of this Argument, it must be this, That the Toleration the Dissenters have so long enjoyed, is as much as their Zeal and Fidelity can claim; So that they wou'd have no ground to complain of the Government, tho it thou'd refuse to give 'em any security for the Continuance of it. And this seems to be the *Answerer's* sense, because in Reply to the second Reason draw'n from the Indulgence granted to Foreign Protestants, he observes, *'Tis only granted for 7 Years, in hopes that after the Expiration of that Term, they wou'd declare themselves Members of the Establish'd Church*; But what if after those 7 Years the *French Churches* in this Kingdom, choose rather to Adhere to the model of their own Discipline and Worship; will the *Answerer* then think 'em unworthy of a renewed *Legal Toleration*? If not, what signifies his *Answer* to the Argument, That 'tis most reasonable to extend the same Favour to his Majesties *born* Subjects, that we do to *Foreigners*. If he think 'em in that case unworthy of it, I wou'd gladly know on what grounds he thinks so. What grand Crime wou'd it be, if after so many Years, those Faithful Confessors of Christ shou'd still prefer the model of their own Worship and Discipline, to any other? Wou'd they therefore deserve to be Treated here as they were in *France*? And whatever the *Answerer* may think of the forward Inclination of the Fr. Protestants to their Church-Government and Worship, all the world knows to whose Discipline and Worship their own is most conformable. And how far soever Temporal Interest engages the compliance of some of 'em, yet there are few of 'em, but if left to their free Liberty, wou'd choose their own. And the most of their Ministers swallow the Reordination requir'd of 'em (how smoothly soever palliated) with great reluctancy, and not without some disgust against the Imposers of it.

Answerer Thirdly, *The Papists are not in equal Circumstances of publick Favour, with our Dissenting Brethren: For as the Liberty they have in the Exercise of their Religion, was extorted from the Government by the pressing necessity of publick Affairs, so its not Confirm'd to 'em, by any Act of Parliament as this Indulgence is expected, and I suppose designed to be to Protestant Dissenters.*

Reply. 'Tis not easy to perceive where the force of this *Answer* lyes. For a *publick Treaty* is a considerable security to the *Papists*; and is it not then Reasonable to grant, if possible, a fuller to Protestant Dissenters? When as the *Answerer* himself insinuates, the one extorted it from the Government, in order to the suppressing their Rebellion: The other deserv'd it by their Assistance in the Reduction of this Kingdom. Is it not reasonable at least to make this small difference between those who have Deserv'd so ill, and those that have Deserv'd so well of the Government?

Answerer, Fourthly, The Experience that our Dissenting Brethren have had of our Tenderness towards 'em heretofore, is a sufficient Argument and Security to 'em of our future Kindness.

Repl. We must beg the *Answerers* pardon, if after so frequent Experience of the renewed Storms that fell on our Brethren in *England* during the late Reigns, and of what we sometimes felt here in *Ireland*, whenever any Court-turn was to be served by the revival of penal severities, we do not think a *general Declaration of tenderness* a sufficient *Security* to us from future persecution. Especially when we know not what a change, many Turns in publick Affairs may make in the Passions and Interests of Men. So that we cannot but apprehend a *Legal* Liberty more desireable and satisfying then an *Arbitrary* one, that's as easily recall'd as granted. Tho we must in Gratitude add, That none can repose a more entire confidence in his Majesty, and the present Government then we do, on whose Justice and Goodness we can chearfully rely, tho some Mens Ill-will shou'd obstruct this Effect of it.

Answer, For we consider our mutual Agreement in the same Articles of Faith, and are glad to find this Author is pleased to declare, That the suppressing of Protestant Dissenters, by the strict Execution of Penal Laws, is a practice that has a just Odium left upon it. But are sorry that the just Odium left upon it among us, shou'd be wholly confin'd to us, and that this practice shou'd have no Censure nor Reflection cast upon it among our Neighbours. And 'tis strange the Author shou'd say, that there is so apparent Contrariety in it to the Mild and Merciful Genius of our Holy Religion, seeing he cannot but know the time when 'twas an avowed doctrine, and a general practice among the Presbyterians and Independents, to barr the members of the Church of England *from the free exercise of divine Worship according to their Consciences. And 'tis strange that this practice shou'd be so apparently contrary to our holy Religion, and have so mischievous Effects upon the publick peace here in this Kingdom, and yet be thought so great an Evidence*

of a Truly Christian Zeal, and so effectual an Instrument of publick Good in Scotland; *and how possibly can our Author hope, That all Protestants are in this point come to a better Temper, then to gratifie their Enemies by ruining their Brethren when there is too plain a Demonstration of the contrary, unless he be of Opinion that what is a warm and Sanguine Temper of Religion there, is to be esteem'd the raging heat of a malignant Feavor here.*

Reply. I am glad the *Answerer* considers our Agreement in *Faith*; But am sorry we are no better agreed about *matters of Fact*, which were they indeed such as the *Answerer* represents 'em, I must own this a very good Argument *ad hominem* in respect of the *Scots Presbyterians* in this Kingdom. Tho I must tell him, The Argument wou'd not concern the *Author* of the *Case* at all, who wou'd joyn with the *Answerer* in passing as severe a censure on those of *Scotland*, as he wou'd do on any of the *Episcopal* perswasion that are guilty of the like severitys, if this supposition of our *Answerer* were true. But if it be a very groundless charge against 'em founded on palpable mistakes about notorious matters of fact, then I hope the Answerer will retract these unjust and harsh Censures, and will no more upbraid us with the severitys of *Scotland*, or make them an objection against the *Toleration* which Dissenting Protestants desire in this Kingdom. And therefore to silence this clamour, and stop those misreports that have had so pernicious influence to raise these new jealousies among us from the pretended practice of *Scotland*, I must refer the Reader to the following Letter sent me by one that has good ground to understand the affairs of that Kingdom better then the *Answerer*.

Sir. I presume you will think your self obliged on several accounts to vindicate the Dissenters Case against the Answer which I find publish'd this morning. And because the main strength of the exceptions against your Paper seems to turn upon the hinge of a suppos'd severity practis'd in *Scotland* against those of the Episcopal Perswasion there, I therefore send you a *Memorial of the affairs of the Church of Scotland since the Revolution*, penn'd upon an occasion wherein interest as well as honesty obliged the Authors to be just to truth, together with an *Abstract taken from the Original Archives of the Committee of Estates and Council of Scotland containing a list of all the Episcopal Clergy turn'd out by the State in Scotland*. And both these Papers as to the matters of fact contain'd in 'em being taken from the publick Records of that Nation (and consequently being of as much contestable evidence & moral certainty as such things can well be) will I hope undeceive the minds of those whom misinformation has fill'd with such strange prejudice against the Dissenters *here* because of the ill usage which those of the Episcopal perswasion are suppos'd to receive in *Scotland*. I am content, if you think it needful that both these papers be Printed: But since the present conjuncture renders it unfit your Answer shou'd be delaid, all that be done. In the mean while, for the satisfaction of such as are willing to be rightly inform'd, you may confidently because truly assert the following particulars, which shall be undeniably demonstrated.

1. That tho all the *Bishops* of *Scotland* did in their Address to K. *James* upon his present Majesties Descent into *England*, express their utmost abhorrence of that Descent; Yet they were all call'd by his Majesty's Letter to the *Convention* in *Scotland*, as well as the *Peers* and *Commons* of that Kingdom.

2. That they all unanimously deserted the said *Convention* upon the Settlement of the Crown on their Majesties King *William and Queen Mary*. And tho this was not the *only*, yet this was *one main* Reason why the *Estates* of *Scotland* threw 'em quite out.

3. All the Abetters of *Viscount Dundee's* Rebellion were or pretended to be of the Episcopal perswasion, as have also all those that have made any publick Commotions in that Kingdom, since this happy Revolution.

4. Yet notwithstanding all this, there is not so much as one single man (much less any body of men) of the Episcopal Clergy in *Scotland*, who were in the possession of the Churches and publick Livings when King *James* abdicated, and forfeited, who has been since King *William's* accession to the Throne, thrust out for any other Crime than either 1. *Not reading the Proclamation, whereby King* William *and Queen* Mary *were declared King and Queen*. Or, 2. *For their not praying for their Majesties*. Or, 3. *For not swearing the Oath of Allegiance and Assurance*. Or, 4. *For such Immoralities as the Church of* England *untruly disclaim as Presbyterians*. 'Tis true indeed, before the Settlement of the Crown, and when there was *no King in that Israel*, a great many Ministers in the West were by the *Rabble* thrust from their Churches. And tho none can excuse that illegal violence, yet none that considers the unparallell'd Barbarities practis'd in *Scotland* under the former Reigns, and how greatly many of those Clergy-men had prejudic'd the people against 'em by the Oppression they had in those cruelties, can either much wonder at the rash violence of an enraged Rabble, or censure the Government, that they did not in these circumstances hazard the overturning the whole Revolution, by immediately resettling 'em in their Parishes against the grain of the people.

5. So

5. So far are they in *Scotland*, from *Exerciſing Severities againſt Men for their being Epiſcopal in their Judgment*, That a great part of the Miniſters of that Kingdom who enjoyed, not only the Protection of the Government, but the free and publick Exerciſe of their Miniſtry, together with the legally Eſtabliſht Maintenance before the firſt of *September* laſt, were, or profeſt to be of the *Epiſcopal* Perſwaſion, and (which is very unuſual) had not all that time ſo much as taken the Oath of Allegiance to His Majeſty. And yet of theſe, no more is requir'd for their continuance in their Pariſhes, than that they take the ſaid *Oath of Allegiance and Aſſurance*, and that they behave themſelves *worthily in Doctrine, Life, and Converſation*; as appears by the *Act of Parliament* paſt 16 *July* 1695. And accordingly, the *London* Gazette mentions a 100 of 'em that have lately taken the Oath of Allegiance and Aſſurance. So that, The Non-Swearing Epiſcopal Clergy in *Scotland*, have been more tenderly dealt with, and much longer forborn in hopes of bringing 'em to a Compliance with the King's Authority, than the Non-Swearing Epiſcopal Clergy of *England* and *Ireland*; whoſe deprivation I ſuppoſe the *Anſwerer* will not call a Perſecution on the Account of Religion.

6. All ſuch may be in *Scotland* admitted for the Future to Eccleſiaſtical Employments and Benefices, who have the general Qualifications requiſite in all Miniſters of the Goſpel, who give their aſſent to the Confeſſion of Faith, and who take the Oath of Allegiance and Aſſurance; provided, they apply to Church-Judicatories for Admiſſion, and promiſe their Submiſſion to Presbyterian Government, which thoſe of the Epiſcopal Perſwaſion did in their own *formula* offer to do. And thus, even thoſe that were turned out by the *Rabble*, may be Received and Admitted to *vacant* Churches.

7. As to *Civil* Employments, no Man is incapacitated for 'em, who takes the *Oaths of Allegiance and Aſſurance*, whatever his Judgment be, *for* or *againſt* Epiſcopal Government. (The Aſſurance is no more than a Declaration which thoſe that take the Oath of Fidelity, are to make, that they account K. *William* a Rightful King, and not an Uſurper, and Swear Fidelity to him as King in that Senſe.) If any Perſons in *Scotland* ever were *Epiſcopal* in their Judgment, the late and preſent *Dukes of Queenſborough*, the *Earl of Lithgow*, *Viſcount Tarbet*, *Earl of Broadalbin*, *Maſter of Stairs*, and many others were ſo, who have enjoyed, or now actually poſſeſs the greateſt Places of Honour, Truſt and Profit in that Kingdom: So that, upon the whole, The *Epiſcopal Diſſenters* in *Scotland*, have much more favour there, than the *Proteſtant Diſſenters* of *Ireland* ever pretended to deſire. You may rely on the Truth of this Account, ſent you by

SIR,

Yours, &c.

For the two *Papers* referr'd to in this Letter, ſince they fully juſtifie the Truth of all that's here aſſerted; they ſhall if it be needful, in a little time be Publiſht, for the ſatisfaction of all that are willing to ſee theſe matters ſet in their true Light; and I hope the *Anſwerer* will grant that how faulty ſoever both have been in former ſeverities (tho I think 'tis apparent thoſe of the Eſtabliſh't Church have been far greater) yet in this Revolution, *Scotland* has ſet 'em a very Commendable Example of moderation; which if they will once come up to and equal, we ſhall give 'em leave to cenſure any thing that may yet ſeem too hard in their *Conſtitution*, of which I know few Parties that ever were altogether free, when they got the upper hand.

Anſwerer, Fourthly, As concerning the Eſtabliſhing Toleration by a Law, The "Reaſon why ſome may be againſt it, is not (as our Author Invidiouſly inſinu-"ates) that they wait for a more favourable opportunity to revive the former ſeveri-"ties againſt 'em, but that they may ſtill have it in their Power to ſhew their Tender-"derneſs to their Diſſenting Brethren, and may prevent, or repreſs the Miſdemea-"nors that ſome Nonconformiſts may poſſibly be guilty of, if they had a Legal To-"leration. As alſo, that they may ſecure the Eſtabliſht Religion they profeſs againſt "the dangerous Conſequences they fear from a general Indulgence.

Repl. There is no ſuch ſatisfying Mark of *Tenderneſs* to the Proteſtant Diſſenters, as the giving 'em this Legal Security. 'Tis hard to forbear ſome Jealouſie of thoſe that will ſtill hold a ſevere Laſh in their Hand.

But what does the Answerer mean by those Misdemeanors, which he wou'd have it in their Power to repress. If he mean Matters of meer Non-conformity, which he wou'd have still a Power left to repress; then we have but too just occasion to suspect the Designs of those that wou'd obstruct the Indulgence. If he mean any other Misdemeanors, a Legal Indulgence will not disable the Civil Magistrate from Repressing 'em, much less from securing the Establisht Religion from any Danger that a Toleration of Protestants can expose it to.

" *Answerer*, Lastly, As to what he saith concerning His Majesties Declaration, I " desire this Author to consider more seriously, whether there be not some others in " the Three Kingdoms, besides the Protestant Dissenters of *Ireland*, to whom one " great End of His Majesties Declaration is yet unaccomplisht, and whether there be " a Law made to cover the Protestant Episcopal Clergy in *Scotland* from Persecution, " on the account of Religion.

Reply, I doubt not, the *Answerer* is by this time satisfi'd, to how little purpose this *Question* is askt, and what *Reply* may be given to it. For no Protestants are Persecuted in *Scotland* on the Account of *Religion*, either by the Civil or Ecclesiastical Government. Nay, the Meetings of the Episcopal Clergy have long been undisturb'd, tho' they refused to own the King's Authority. But sure our *Answerer* cannot expect there shou'd be a *Law to Tolerate* those, that will not own the *Civil Authority*, by which they are *Tolerated*. And were the Dissenters here so disaffected to the Government they cou'd have no pretence to desire a Legal Toleration.

The Second Thing desir'd by Protestant Dissenters is, *That there be no such Clause as next to this Bill, as would disable 'em from serving their King and their Country.*

" As to this, The Answerer saith, That in plain Terms, 'tis no more than this, " That where Ease to Tender Consciences is the only thing they formerly desired, " They now claim it as their due to be admitted also into all honourable and profi- " table Employments; and without these, whatever Ease be given to their Consciences " 'Tis to be fear'd they will have no quiet in their minds.

Reply, The Protestant Dissenters of *Ireland* do not (as the *Answerer* seems to insinuate here) seek any new Priviledg or Favour, but only are unwilling to have a New Yoke put upon 'em. They claim nothing as their due, in Reference to the Civil Government, but to be Treated as Dutiful Subjects, without having any Mark of publick Infamy, and distrust put upon 'em by a New Law. And if any shou'd attempt to do so, they may well forgive the Protestant Dissenters, That tho' they have ease to their Consciences, yet they shou'd have no great quiet in their minds. For they have their Lives and Fortunes to Secure, of which 'tis no wonder, if they should be fearful, when they see some Men so unwilling to consult our common Safety, in a Kingdom liable to so frequent Returns of fatal Irish Rebellions.

The Author of the Case propos'd several Arguments, to shew the *Inexpediency* of any such *Test* as shall disable Protestant Dissenters from serving their King and their Country. As

First, *The Sacrament Test in* England *was chiefly design'd against the Papists.* To which the *Answerer* Replies, „ That the Dissenters are included in the Body of the Act.

Reply, None doubts, but that Act enjoyns the Sacramental Test. But the *Preface* as well as *Title* of the Act, shews That the *End* propos'd, was *the preventing Dangers from Popish Recusants*; which *End* wou'd be sufficiently attain'd by the *Declaratory Test* against Popery in that Act, tho' the Sacrament Test were left out.

But the *Answerer* adds, " If the Zeal of the English Dissenters against Popery in " the late times has not exempted 'em from a Sacramental Test, our Dissenting Bre- " thren in this Kingdom, cannot with modesty expect, that their late Services should " entitle 'em to any such Immunities.

Reply, Even the Zeal of English Dissenters, did in His Majesties Judgment deserve such a Favour, as the Removal of that Test there, which he mov'd his first Parliament to, in his Speech to 'em: But the Protestant Dissenters of *Ireland* who were not hamper'd with this Clog, as those of *England* were, had the opportunity of shewing their Zeal more Remarkably; And 'twere hard to put that very Clog on 'em now, to our freedom from which, we must in part ascribe it, that this whole Kingdom, was not then entirely lost.

Secondly,

Secondly. The Author of the Case Argues. That such a Test for disabling Protestant Dissenters for any Publick Services, is against the common Protestant Interest of *Ireland*.

This Argument the *Author* more largely insisted on, than the *Answerer* seems willing, either to Repeat or Consider. However, Let us hear what he Objects.

Answerer, Our Circumstances indeed vastly differ (as he says) from those of *England*. "For here the Estabilisht Church is more in danger then there [by Protestant Dissenters as well as by the common Enemy. In *England* one unmixt People dos compose the Body of the Nation, *&c.* Here we are made up of several Nations, and there is a daily Accession of great Numbers from a Neighbouring Kingdom of whom the meaner sort are generally of a different Communion, tho the Gentry, and Nobility, *&c.* are generally Conformists.

Reply, The *Author* of the *Case* Argues from the *common Protestant Interest of* Ireland, That since tht *Papists* in this Kingdom are *Ten*, or perhaps *twenty* to *one Protestant*; 'tis therefore necessary to give the Protestant Interest the widest Basis here, by excluding no Protestants from Publick Service. That is, if a thousand Men have ten or twenty thousand Enemies to secure themselves against; 'Tis against their Interest to divide their Strength, by disabling three hundred of 'em from being employ'd in any publick Post for their common Defence: But the *Answerer*, instead of making any Reply to this, only tels us what he thinks to be most Conducive to the seperate Interests of one party of Protestants; As if the seperate Interest of that party, were the Interest of the whole Body of Protestants, or at least, were of farr greater Value and Consideration, than their common Interest.

But why may not those of the Estabilisht Church secure their common Interest as protestants, without any Danger to their seperate Interests, as a distinct party?

While all protestants that deserve well of the Government meet with Encouragement and Favour, Their united strength will be their Impregnable security; And yet since all Employments are in the disposal of the Government; And since the Estabilisht Church has so absolutely the Ascendant in *England*, there is no ground to fear the Government here will be so Lavish and Imprudent in bestowing their favours, as to encourage the Protestant Dissenters to any degree, that can render them dangerous to the Estabilisht Church, or put it into their Power to Act any thing to her prejudice. And yet 'tis most reasonable the Government should encourage 'em so farr, as is truly conducive to our common Security; So that, there can be no difficulty in according the Common *Protestant* Interest, with the particular Interests of the Estabilisht Church, Nay those can be no other way so Effectualy secured unless they think their own Strength alone a sufficient ballance to that of the Irish Papists But I am sorry to find, that the *Answerer* should reckon the Estabilisht Church to be in so great danger of those, that have so lately help't to restore her to her present safety and grandeure: Why should he so soon mistake those as pernicious Enemys who in the late troubles were found to be so hearty Friends? I hope these are only his own narrow Sentiments concerning the protestant Dissenters, and that all moderate Conformists entertain a more just and Charitable Opinion of 'em, having never in this Kingdom, had the least ground for such peevish Surmises, as these of the *Answerer*.

Answerer, "Tis possible indeed, as he observes, That the Irish may be more numerous, if there "shou'd be a general peace; and I may add, The Papists will probably grow much more numerous "If there shou'd be a general Indulgence; and therefore notwithstanding our Authors Opinion, we "cannot think fit to give the Protestant Interest a wider Basis here then it has in Holland, *&c.* "where all protestants are not equally capable of Employments without Religious Tests.

Reply, The *Answerer* has been oft told, 'Tis no *General* Indulgence the *Author* of the *Case* pleads for; and therefore, he reasons here to no purpose; unless he imagine, That the *Papists* will grow more numerous by a Tolleration to those *Protestants*, whose Faith is the same with that of the Estabilisht Church; And does he think, That we can easily digest such a Paradox as this, upon his bare Assertion? And for the Case of *Holland*, which the *Answerer* wou'd here parallel with our own; and where he tels us, There are Religious Tests. 'Tis easily replyed, there is a plain disparity. For besides, that their *Tests* run upon Doctrinal differences; 'Tis evident that those who adhere to the Protestant Religion as there Estabilisht, are a large Body, to which those that are excluded from publick service bear no proportion. And consequently, There is no great Danger to the State from such a Test: Whereas, here the Papists are a hundred to Ten, in respect of the whole body of Protestants; so that to disable all dissenting ones, were to cut off from the common Protestant Interest, about a 3d part of its strength, when the whole is rather too little. And the *Answerer* has as yet given us no other reason for doing so, but his own groundless Fears of a Danger, which as I have shewed him, If it were real (as it is not) may be easily obviated by the Government.

The *Author* having put the Case of another *Irish Rebellion*; The *Answerer* tells us, "There is reason to believe the Consideration of the Common Safety, and the gratitude of Dissenters for their Indulgence, wou'd engage 'em to shew an equal Zeal as "they did before; tho' they shou'd not be wholy on equal Terms with those of the Estabilisht Church, since they cou'd not reasonably hope for so kind a Treatment from "the Papists, as from them.

Reply,

Reply, The Proteſtant Diſſenters are not ſo vain, as ever to expect in this Kingdom, to be *wholly on equal Terms* with thoſe of the Eſtabliſht Church. But can he expect, That any Gentlemen among 'em in ſuch a Caſe as is here propos'd, wou'd raiſe Forces for others to Command 'em, or their Tenants chearfully Riſe with thoſe on whom they have no Dependence, and in whom they can as little Truſt; or can he think, that ſuch Gentlemen will chearfully Raiſe and Command Forces in ſuch an Exigency, when inſtead of any proſpect of having their Services conſider'd or rewarded, they muſt rather expect to pay 500 l. for their Preſumption. What Encouragement is this to induce Men to venture their Lives and Fortunes to ſave their Country, when they are in hazard of being puniſht for endeavouring it: Nay, Who does he think wou'd be tempted to ſtay in a Country where his Danger from a common Enemy is ſo great, and where he is put under ſuch a diſability of doing any thing conſiderable to prevent it?

Thirdly for the Argument drawn from the *Parliament of England*, the *Author* urges it no farther then as a probable preſumption that they thought no other *Teſt* needful to qualify men for Employments in this Kingdom then they there Enjoyn. And if they had thought the *Sacrament Teſt* needfull here, they cou'd eaſily have added it as They have the *Teſt* againſt Popery mentioned in the ſame *Act*. For they were not Ignorant, That it was not in force here. And againſt this there is nothing to the purpoſe in the *Anſwerers* Reply.

Fourthly, For the *Authors* Argument to prove the *Teſt* unreaſonable. *Viz. That, it will put the Proteſtant Diſſenters into worſe Circumſtances then they are at preſent.* The *Anſwerer* ſeems to grant it, but ſuggeſts on the other hand. That a Tolleration "without ſuch a Teſt, will put the Members of the Eſtabliſht Church into worſe Circumſtances then they are in at preſent; Therefore ſince the Conformiſts appear'd as early and with equal Zeal for this Goverment as the diſſenters The former (he thinks) "will have reaſon to think themſelves ſeverely dealt with, if no other way can be "found of rewarding the ſervice of diſſenters, without hazarding the moſt valuable "Rights of the Conformiſts, by admitting the diſſenters into ſuch offices as may give "e'm power and oppotrunity to alter the whole frame of the preſent Church Government."

Anſw. I cannot imagine how the granting diſſenting Proteſtants what they now deſire ſhou'd put the Eſtabliſht Church into *worſe Circumſtances then they are now in*, when the Diſſenters deſire no more then that things may continue in the ſame peaceable and amicable poſture they are in, or (what is the ſame) that a Legal Tolleration may ſecure to 'em what they now enjoy through the favour of the Government. And I wou'd fain know what Rights of the Church have been hazarded ſince this Revolution, unleſs the *Anſwerer* ſuppoſes it the peculiar Right of *Conforming Proteſtants*, that none ſhou'd ſerve the Government but themſelves. But why may not the Government employ a few Proteſtant Diſſenters in a few inferior Offices, (as they now do) without admitting them into ſo many and ſo Important ones as ſhould give 'em any power or opportunity to alter the preſent Church-Government? Theſe things are eaſily conſiſtent; And the anſwerer knows well enough, There is no ground to fear leſt the Government *here* ſhou'd ſo farr Deviate from the meaſures of *England*, as to be guilty of ſo great a miſtake, as to put the Diſſenters into any Capacity of overturning the Eſtabliſht Church. Much leſs need the Anſwerer fear that the *Conformiſt* Officers at *Derry*, *Iniskillen*, *Cram*, *&c.* ſhould apprehend themſelves wrong'd that thoſe who were embark't with 'em in the ſame Cauſe, ſhould have ſome ſmall ſhare with 'em in the Rewards of their Courage. None that are generous enough to value true merit wou'd envy the juſt recompence of it. And I perceive the Anſwerer himſelf has ſo much of that good quality as not to think it altogether *inconvenient that ſuch Perſons ſhou'd be excepted from the propoſed Teſt.* But I am ſorry that he ſhould think it *Convenient* to diſable all Diſſenting Proteſtants for the future from Imitating the Commendable Zeal and Courage of their Bretheren, as if he either envy'd the Reputation they have acquir'd, or Imagin'd there would never be any more occaſion for their aſſiſtance to preſerve their Country.

For the Argument drawn from the *unfitness of the Sacrament Test*; I need only ſuggeſt the following particulars to invalidate the *Anſwerer's* Replys.

1. The Government may have occaſion to employ many in publick Offices (eſpecially military ones), and apparently does employ many, that ſhou'd be rather according to the Rubrick, *debarr'd* from the Sacrament, then thus *driven* to it.

2. If thoſe be the fitteſt to be employed by the State, that *give the greateſt Evidences of their Piety to Almighty God*; Then I ſuppoſe the Anſwerer will allow us to eſtimate the Piety of the Eſtabliſht Church, by that of thoſe who enjoy Civil and Military preferments in it. And then I hope alſo that ſuch ſhou'd not be excluded from this *Priviledg* who give equal Evidences of their Piety with any of their Fellow ſubjects.

3. To make the different *Mode* of Receiving the Sacrament, ſuch a *Teſt* is to make it the Engine of a State-party, and conſequently a means to divide the affections of thoſe whom the Sacrament it ſelf ſhou'd unite in mutual Love.

4. It will no way juſtifie the reaſonableneſs of making the different *Mode* of Receiving the *Teſt* of all *Offices* in the *State*, becauſe the Intereſt of Religion is little concern'd in it, and 'tis but comparatively a *trivial* thing.

For the more *trivial* it is, The leſs weight ſhou'd any wiſe Government lay upon it, and the more willing ſhou'd they be to leave Men to their Liberty about it.

But ſays the *Anſwerer*, " Why ſhou'd any ſeparate for ſo trivial a matter, and why ſhou'd the " State employ thoſe that refuſe to give ſo trivial and inconſiderable a mark of their complyance " with it's Orders?

Repl. The *Anſwerer* ſure cannot be ignorant, that when theſe different Modes of Worſhip, are call'd *trivial*, 'tis in reſpect of their *Intrinſique Importance*, not in reſpect of the *Conſciences* of thoſe that ſcruple 'em. Now that may be in it ſelf an *inconſiderable thing*, which yet the Conſcience of a wiſe Man may for fear of ſinning, not dare to comply with. For inſtance, The *Eating* or not *Eating of Blood*, is comparatively a ſmall and trivial matter. And yet many Men no way inferior to the Anſwerer in either Learning or Wiſdom, have thought the *Eating of blood* unlawful among Chriſtians themſelves. Now let us ſuppoſe the number of ſuch were as conſiderable in the Kingdom, as that of Proteſtant Diſſenters is. Wou'd it be any way becoming the prudence of the Government to make this trivial difference the Teſt of a State-party? Wou'd it be a fit Law for the wiſdom of a Nation to enact, *That none ſhou'd be admitted to ſerve their King and their Country, that ſcruples the Eating of a black Pudding*. And yet the Intereſt of the State wou'd be as much concern'd in the deciſion of this Queſtion as that of the Church, and of real Religion in the other. There are indeed ſome, whoſe judgment has that latitude that they cou'd Receive the Sacrament, either Kneeling, Sitting, or Standing. But there are many, no way inferior for Wiſdom or Integrity, (whatever the Anſwerer inſinuates to the contrary) who think themſelves oblig'd to Receive in the poſture moſt ſuitable to a Religious Feaſt, and really ſcruple *Kneeling* in the Act of Receiving, tho they either kneel or ſtand, at the ſolemn worſhip offer'd before and after. I ſhall not here either eſpouſe their Opinion, or examine the grounds of it, but only infer how unreaſonable a ſtreſs thoſe lay on a dubious Rite, that is comparatively of ſo ſmall moment, who wou'd render all thoſe unſerviceable to their Country, and thereby debar 'em from the common Rights of all Dutiful and Well-affected Subjects, who cannot comply with it. Whereas often the beſt of Men are proneſt to ſcruple what the worſt can without any difficulty ſwallow.

Laſtly, The *Author* argues, *That the Eſtabliſh't Church will be no way endanger'd by the Indulgence.*

To which the *Anſwerer* replys. " That tho the Honors & Revenues of the Clergy are ſecur'd " to 'em, yet none can foreſee the difficulties, the Conforming Clergy may poſſibly conteſt with, " in aſſerting the Rites of the Church, if Non Conformiſt's were qualified for Civil offices.

Reply, the Non Conformiſt's have been both before and ever ſince the Revolution qualified for 'em and yet the Clergy have met with no oppoſition in aſſerting the Rites of the Church; and I agree with the Anſwerer that no wiſe man can foreſee any difficulties they are in danger of meeting with for the future.

" But the Anſwerer adds, beſides we are far leſs concern'd for the ſecurity of our Temporal In- " tereſt then for the Eſtabliſhment of our ancient, holy and peaceable Religion.

Reply. If the Eſtabliſhment of their ancient, holy and peaceable Religion be the great matter the Anſwerer is concern'd for, Thoſe who deſire the Toleration will openly declare their embracing the ſame Religion and Faith with 'em. And for the other matters in difference we muſt beg the Anſwerers pardon, if we think that 'tis chiefly Temporal Intereſt has hitherto rendred ſome men ſo deaf to all Propoſals for an accommodation of 'em.

I am glad to find, that the *Anſwerer* not only owns the good ſervices of the Diſſenters in this Kingdom, but declares *he wou'd not exclude 'em from a capacity of concurring to preſerve their Country again*. But 'tis ſtrange how he ſhou'd think they wou'd be in the ſame circumſtances (if a like juncture ſhou'd happen) to ſerve their King and Country tho not legally qualifi'd for Offices. For they did not then run any riſque of ſevere penalties by commanding the forces they rais'd, as now they wou'd do. Their hands were then looſe, whereas now they will be ty'd up, and a *Legal Padlock* clapt on the ſwords of all that have intereſt enough to bring men into the Field.

For what was ſaid of the *peaceable behaviour of Proteſtant Diſſenters in this Kingdom*, ſince the *Anſwerer* does not deny it; Why ſhou'd he go about to detract from it, by imputing it to their want of opportunity to ſhew their turbulency and diſaffection to the Government? For *Scotland*, I have already ſhewn him his miſtakes about their preſent practice there. For *England*, if he refer to the *Civil Wars*, he has been often told, they were begun by *Conformiſts*, with whom it was no wonder if the perſecuted Non-Conformiſts did concurr, to be ſhelter'd from their Perſecutors. And for their Principles in reference to Civil Government, I wou'd deſire the *Anſwerer* to ſhew me any difference between thoſe contain'd in the 39 *Articles*, and in the *Aſſembly's Confeſſion of Faith*.

The Anſwerer concludes, *That no Motives ought to prevail on 'em to make ſuch large Conceſſions to the Diſſenters, as will in all probability ſhake the foundations of the Eſtabliſht Church.*

Reply. Nor are any ſuch large Conceſſions deſir'd. But I hope the *Anſwerer* does not take it for one of the foundations of the Eſtabliſht Church, that none ſhou'd ſerve the Government but themſelves. For if he do, nothing can in this Kingdom ſo probably ſhake the Eſtabliſht Church, as the making its foundation too narrow, and nothing can ſo effectually ſtrengthen it, as the making it a little wider, to comprehend thoſe whom in this caſe, intereſt as well as gratitude, will oblige to ſupport it.

All I ſhall add in reference to the Anſwerer and all others that are of his opinion in this matter is this, If what is here ſuggeſted, do not convince him of the neceſſity and reaſonableneſs of granting to the Proteſtant Diſſenters a Toleration without this Teſt, yet the Proteſtant Diſſenters do at leaſt deſire that a Toleration with it may not be obtruded upon 'em as a favour. For to allude to the Anſwerer's Expreſſions concerning it; ſuch a Toleration they think wou'd be as prejudicial to their health, as 'tis diſtaſteful to their palats; and to force it on 'em, wou'd be to act like thoſe churliſh Parents, *that when their children ask for Bread, give 'em a ſtone; and when they ask for fiſh, give 'em a ſerpent.*

Since the writing this Paper, I have ſeen another, (which is only a Tranſcript of the 2d part of the *Anſwer*, with Enlargements indeed, but little or no amendments) Entituled, *The Caſe of the Diſſenters of* Ireland *conſidered, in reference to the Sacramental Teſt.* But ſince there is little occurs in it that is material, more than what has been already examin'd in the Anſwer, I ſhall only add the following Reflections on it.

1. The Eſtabliſht Church in *Ireland* can never be in any real danger from Proteſtant Diſſenters, while *Ireland* is in ſuch entire dependence on *England*, and nothing can be done *here*, but under the conduct and controll of the Government *there*. Nay, the Eſtabliſht Church will be much more *hazarded* then *ſecur'd* by narrowing the common Proteſtant Intereſt here. So that both the *Anſwerer* and the *Conſiderer* from their eager concern to obviate an *imaginary* and *improbable*, almoſt wholly overlook a real and certain danger.

2. The Conſiderer ſeems ill-employed in reviving theſe common but groundleſs jealouſies concerning Proteſtant Diſſenters here. He does not indeed, as the *Anſwerer*, call thoſe he is jealous of, by their own name of *Scots*, but out of a certain tenderneſs ſtyles 'em *Britiſh*. But whereas he takes a peculiar pleaſure in repeating the out-worn ſtory of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, (as if the Anſwerer had not ſaid enough of it). I wou'd gladly, for once, ask him, whether the moſt intemperate heats of the Scots Covenanters ever came to that extravagant height as the zeal of the Epiſcopal Party in that Kingdom, when they made it death to Preach, or even to Pray in a houſe with five more preſent then thoſe of the Family? And why ſhou'd theſe Gentlemen then delight to rake ſuch matters as theſe out of the Grave of Oblivion in which they have lain ſo long, when they know that Recriminations are ſo obvious, and may be made to ſo great advantage? Since Time and Experience have done ſo much to mature the Judgements, and mellow the Tempers of men on both ſides to more of Wiſdom and Peace; Why ſhou'd ſo much pains be taken to blow up thoſe ſparks that are almoſt wholly extinct? And whereas the Conſiderer ſtarts a new ſuſpicion from the *Aſſemblys Catechiſm*, which he tells us, declares *That a falſe Worſhip is not to be Tolerated, and that they accounts that of the Eſtabliſh't Church to be ſuch.*

To remove this bug-bear alſo out of the way, I need do no more then acquaint him, that 'tis only a *Toleration of a falſe Religion*, that the *Aſſembly* accounts a breach of the 2d Command. But they never accounted that of the Eſtabliſht Church to be ſuch (as the *Conſiderer* here very groundleſſly aſſerts.) Nay, the Proteſtant Diſſenters are ready to give the higheſt aſſurance of the contrary poſſible by ſubſcribing its doctrinal Articles of Religion. Nor do the Diſſenters deſire any other Toleration for their own Worſhip then what they wou'd think themſelves oblig'd in Conſcience to give to all their fellow-Proteſtants. So that this Stumbling-block is eaſily remov'd out of the *Conſiderer's* way.

3. The *Conſiderer* has diſcover'd the myſtery of Church-politicks in the Framing of that Act in *England*, which enjoyns the Sacrament-Teſt, the ſpecious Title whereof is, only to *prevent dangers from Popiſh Recuſants* but it ſeems the real intent was to choke the Diſſenters as well as them.

4. The *Conſiderer* need not have follow'd the *Anſwerer* in boaſting of the inclination of French Proteſtants to *their* worſhip when in this Kingdom there are 4 or 5 Churches that adhere to their *own*, tho under all poſſible diſcouragements; and but one that embrace *theirs*, tho drawn to it by the lure of publick maintenance.

5. 'Tis

5. 'Tis a new way of *mercy* to Diſſenters to *cure the Errors of their minds*, by laying the dangerous Temptation before 'em of counteracting their Judgment or their Intereſt. But ſure the Eſtabliſh't Church wou'd have ſmall ground to boaſt of thoſe proſelytes who flee to her only to repair their broken fortunes. If the *Conſiderer, be for rouſing us to the Conſideration of our ſcruples* by new penalties, There is no Argument ſo awakening as the old one of Fire and Faggot, or the modern one of French Dragooning.

6. If the Sacrament Teſt be intended as ſuch a happy Expedient to *diſcriminate the good from the bad*, it ſeems to have been hitherto but ill apply'd.

7. The Author of the Caſe is as much againſt making *ſitting* as *kneeling* or *ſtanding*, the only poſture of thoſe that are admitted to the Lord's-Table, and thinks it ſhou'd not come under any of thoſe narrow *Incloſures*.

8. For the *mode of receiving*, the *Conſiderers* Arguments run all upon a wrong Suppoſition, that whatſoever is accounted a thing of *inconſiderable importance* in Religion ſhou'd be therefore accounted *indifferent*. So that all this mighty noiſe of the Churches power in determining indifferent things (which it ſeems we muſt grant for fear of bidding farewel to all Government in Church and State) will ſignify little. For there are many things that are comparatively of ſmall moment which yet a good man dare not counteract his Judgment in. And in ſuch things all prudent Church-Governours ſhou'd in imitation of the Apoſtles advice, exerciſe forbearance and tenderneſs, *See* 14. *Rom.* —— And ſuch dubious matters, are of all others moſt unfit to make ſuch publick *Teſts* of. For thoſe *Teſts* are only ſnares to keep out thoſe whoſe Conſciences are truly fearful of ſin, and to let in thoſe whoſe *Stomacks* (as the Conſiderer ſpeaks) *are not ſo tender and ſqueamiſh*. Tho on the other hand, I am ſorry to find the Conſiderer ſo ſevere on the doctrine of *occaſional Communion*. For I take thoſe Proteſtants who can occaſionally communicate both with the Eſtabliſht Church and with the Diſſenters, to be the moſt judicious, as well as the moſt moderate perſons, and moſt likely to be the happy inſtruments of healing thoſe Breaches, which perſons of narrower judgments on either hand do unhappily widen.

9. If the Conſiderer think the Diſſenters ſeparation ſo *miſchievous* to the ſouls of men, and be more concern'd to prevent their ſeduction, then to ſecure the temporal Intereſt of the Clergy, He ſhou'd be much more earneſt againſt the Indulgence it ſelf then for the Sacrament-Teſt. Whereas he ſeems freely willing to grant the former, that he may hook in the latter. But I hope he'll find that this Toleration will no way increaſe Errors or Irreligion among the People. Nor need any that diligently feed their Flocks fear others ſtealing their hearts from 'em. And if our Author be ſo Zealous to put a period to ſeparation, he need not reduce himſelf from Epiſcopal grandure to Apoſtolical Poverty, 'tis but making things *neceſſary* the only *Terms of Communion*, and leaving things *unneceſſary indifferent*, and both *Peace* and *Charity* wou'd eaſily be reſtor'd. And all this may be done without retrenching either the dignity or Revenues of any of the Clergy.

10. If the *Conſiderer* is not offended that a few Diſſenters now enjoy the Effects of His Majeſty's favour he need not fear that the Toleration (as 'tis deſir'd) wou'd *open a door to let the whole Party in*; he may very well truſt the prudence of the Government to diſpence thoſe favours to 'em with as moderate and ſparing a hand for the future as they have done hitherto.

11. The Conſiderer ſhou'd have been more Ingenuous then to ſuggeſt, that the Author of the Caſe aſcrib'd to Diſſenters alone the *preſerving this Nation from ruin*, when he never ſpeaks more of 'em, then that they *concurr'd* with the Conformiſts in doing it.

Laſtly, Since the *Conſiderer* very kindly profeſſes that *if a Medium can be found to ſecure the Church and yet content the Diſſenters, he will not be againſt it*, we thankfully own his moderation therein; for if we were not perſwaded that all the favour the diſſenters deſire is fully conſiſtent with the ſecurity of the Eſtabliſh't Church, we ſhou'd never preſume to requeſt or expect it from a Parliament, whoſe Honourable Members are almoſt all of that Communion. But if what we propoſe, will truly unite and Strengthen the Proteſtant Intereſt, we may hope it will be favourably receiv'd by thoſe who in all other Caſes expreſs ſo hearty a Zeal for it.